

Remarks

I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 106, 109, and 110 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans 6,861,131 B2. Claim 106 has been amended. In light of the following remarks as discussed during the phone interview with the Examiner on July 13, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Specifically, the Examiner cites Example 3 in Evans for teaching a method for forming a composite core comprising providing a plurality of tows, guiding the tows through a bath, using an oven and curing as required by claim 106. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's analysis. More specifically, Evans discloses a method wherein fiber tows are dipped into a bath of latex and passed through a tube oven with a temperature range between 550 and 650F. The oven functions to flash the water off and fuse the latex and moreover, does not provide a mechanism to shape the composite product. In fact, the example specifically indicates that the product is shaped after exiting the oven. "Upon exiting, the tow is passed through rollers and flattened." See column 20, line 41.

In contrast, the method disclosed by Applicant uses an oven in conjunction with a die system to form a core of the required configuration and diameter. In particular, the oven heats the resin to a temperature changing the liquid stage of the resin to a semi-cure stage. During this stage the fibers may be bent, compacted, bundled and configured. While the ovens maintain the temperature of the fiber resin matrix, the dies compact the fibers, drive air from the fibers and shape the fibers. Compaction of the segments creates a uniformly distributed, concentric final composite core.

In short, Evans does not teach using an oven in conjunction with a die system. Moreover, there is no suggestion in Evans to use an oven to maintain the temperature of the fiber resin matrix to enable formation of the composite product. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 106, 109 and 110.

II. Allowed Claims

Applicant appreciates Examiner's allowance of claims 114-116.

III. Claim Objections

Examiner objects to claims 107-108 and 111-113. Applicant has amended claim 107 in accordance with Examiner's suggestion.

In light of the foregoing, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if it is believed that such communication will further the prosecution of the application.

8000 East Prentice Ave., Ste. B-6
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
(303) 689-9560, ext. 11
September 19, 2005

Respectfully Submitted,



The McIntosh Group
Kelly de la Torre, Esq.
Reg. No. 53,677